



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

grammatical-rhetorical side. At the end is a table of proper names, and an Index of Latinity, with especial reference to rhetorical terms.

In §39 *videsne igitur ut, ut*, which Heusinger changed to *vel*, is ingeniously filled out to *Brute*, which is used with *vides igitur* in §231; but here also *ut* follows *igitur* immediately, so that it excites a doubt as to whether the *ut* in §39 is a remnant of *Brute*. In §55 *Ti. Coruncanium* is correctly given in the text, but *T. Coruncanium* in the notes. In §71 *sicin* is bracketed as the exclamation of some archaist surprised at this criticism of Cicero upon Livius Andronicus: "Bah! est-ce bien juste?"—an amusing but hardly tenable suggestion. Possibly *sicin* is due to *sic enim* of the line above, but most editors read *sic*. In §81 *Numerius* is an excellent emendation of *nua serius* F, *una ser* BHM. In §86 *asperior*, Moser's conjecture, seems too far from the MS *adhortor* to meet with general approval, even though elsewhere *asperitas* is made a characteristic of Galba, *actuosior* of Baiter and Kayser, read by Stangl, is much nearer to the MSS, and *ardentior*, the common reading, is supported by §276 and by *ardor* in §93. In §131 *Saufeio* is a beautiful conjecture for the unintelligible *savelio*, and likely to keep its place in the text. In §191 Martha reads *Plato enim mihi instar est centum milium*, adopting *centum milium* as the conjecture of Orelli, although Baiter and Kayser, and Stangl, attribute it to Camerarius. Is it not worth while to call attention to the possibility that *me. illum* of the MSS may be simply a misreading of the spelling MEILIVM, I being read L, as so often? Compare MEILIA, Corp. I 551, 4 and 8, and Lucilius, bk. IX, XIV, Mueller, *meile hominum, duo meilia*, etc. On the use of *ei* in Cicero for *i* see Buechler, Rhein. Museum, XI 515. While *centum* is admirably supported by ad Att. II 5. 1, I do not feel certain that *omnium* is wrong. Compare De Off. 3, 3. 11 *ut omnia ex altera parte collocata vix minimi momenti instar habeant*. Wölflin, Arch. II 584, in his article on *instar*, seems to accept *omnium* without *milium*, interpreting 'er zähle, gelte so viel als alle miteinander.' *Milium*, however, or *meilium*, must certainly be retained.

MINTON WARREN.

The Five Zoroastrian GĀTHĀS, with the Zend, Pahlavi, Sanskrit and Persian Texts and Translations, by L. H. MILLS, D. D., Hon. M. A. Oxon. Parts I and 4. Leipsic, 1892.—A study of the five Zarathushtrian (Zoroastrian) Gāthās, with texts and translations, also with the Pahlavi translation, for the first time edited with collation of manuscripts, and now prepared from all the known codices; also deciphered, and for the first time translated in its entirety into a European language, with Neryosangh's Sanskrit text edited with the collation of five MSS, and with a first translation; also with the Persian text contained in Codex 126 of the Munich Collection edited in transliteration, together with a commentary, being the literary apparatus and argument to the translation of the Gāthās in the XXXth volume of the Sacred Books of the East, by L. H. MILLS, D. D., Hon. M. A. Oxon. Part I. Yasna XXVIII-XXXIV; Part IV. Commentary. Oxford, 1892.

The Rev. Lawrence H. Mills, D. D., a presbyter of the American Church, and distinguished Oriental scholar, has devoted himself for twenty years to the study of the sacred books of the Parsees, and more particularly to the

study of the Gâthâs, which are the most important part of the Avesta and at the same time by far the most difficult of interpretation. Not only is the idiom in which these hymns are composed of the greatest importance, but the main principles of the ancient Zoroastrian religion are nowhere else in the Avesta so prominent. During a stay of eight years in Germany Dr. Mills spared no endeavors in collecting all accessible materials for a translation of the Gâthâs, and, not satisfied with studying the original Zend text, he likewise made himself acquainted with the Pahlavi and Parsi translations. In 1887 appeared, as vol. XXXI of the Sacred Books of the East, edited by F. Max Müller, his translation of the Yasna, Visparad, Âfrinagân, Gâhs, and miscellaneous fragments (see my review in *A. J. P. X* 91-94). A new result of Dr. Mills's enlarged studies is the present work, which was published at the close of last year, eagerly expected by all Zendists, and particularly warmly welcomed by the writer of this article. Part I, pp. 1-153, contains the translation of Yasna XXVIII-XXXIV, and gives (1) the Zend text in the original character, with transliteration and with two renderings—the one literal in simple Latin, after the example of Haug; the other, more free and metrical, in English, exact reproduction of metre and words not being attempted; (2) the Pahlavi text transliterated, with various readings and with an English translation; (3) the Sanskrit translation of Neriosengh transliterated, with various readings and with an English translation; (4) the Parsi-Persian translation of the Pahlavi text. As to the designation of the Zend manuscripts, Mills has adopted Geldner's designations, but two MSS were consulted by him which Geldner had not yet compared: Pt. 4 and F* (cf. Supplementary Introd., p. viii). Three fine facsimiles from the codices F² Y. XXIX, 4, 5, F³ Y. XXX, 9, 10, D. Y. XXX, 2, 3, 4 are a welcome addition to the well-composed and in every respect carefully executed first part of the work.

Part IV, pp. 393-621, contains the commentary to the translation of Yasna XXVIII-XXXIV, in which, as a matter of course, we find continual reference to the translation and interpretations in vol. XXXI of the Sacred Books of the East. Both works are closely connected, and both works ought to be studied by those who desire information as to Dr. Mills's province of labor, his method, and the results of his researches. In the preface, and more particularly in the supplementary introduction to his recent work, Dr. Mills explains his mode of proceeding, but for the sake of succinctness refers the reader to the compendious introduction to vol. XXXI of the S. B. of the East, where, besides a very instructive summary of the contents of the Gâthâs, researches are made into their authorship, into the relation of the author's religious system to that of the cuneiform inscriptions, and into the age of the Gâthâs. To the same introduction we must go in order to ascertain Mills's attitude towards the Parsi and Pahlavi translations, and his views of metrical questions, of conjectural criticism, and of the relation of Veda to Avesta. In the commentary likewise there is constant reference to the introductory summaries and additional notes of the earlier translation. As to the translation of texts, the author was induced by the study of so many years, not only to consider conscientiously every possible translation, but likewise to examine carefully the interpretations attempted by other scholars, before writing down his own, and for the same reason, while Dr. Mills has not wantonly varied

from his former renderings, still, as the considerable interval of five years lies between the publication of vol. XXXI of the S. B. of the East and the present edition, he has occasionally changed his former translation, and has even endeavored to improve on different parts of the same book. "The commentary," he says, p. xxv, "was printed while the texts were in manuscript, and in printing the texts later I have suggested improvements up to the last, and I will continue to do so." Although the author, notwithstanding many certain results of his researches, will not and cannot pretend to have succeeded in every point, he may nevertheless justly claim, on account of his cautious and extensive investigations, to have his translation and commentary studied and conscientiously examined by his fellow-interpreters, as every discovered error will facilitate the discovery of truth.

The commentary in Part IV, which comprises the entirety of the Gâthâs, while the text in Part I contains only Yasna XXVIII-XXXIV, bears evidence of the author's enlarged studies, of his philological erudition which equally takes into account grammar, etymology and metric, and of his acute treatment of linguistic matters. The undersigned, who, during the author's stay at Leipsic a few years ago, was in correspondence with him about several passages of the Gâthâs, was convinced even then that Dr. Mills was likely to go about his difficult task with zeal, but at the same time with circumspection. The present commentary confirms this opinion. Dr. Mills tries to do justice to each of the two diverging schools of Avesta-interpreters, to the Eranists as well as to the Vedists, but the undersigned believes that Dr. Mills rather joins with him in accepting the conclusion of the late Paul de Lagarde: "If the words are Vedic, the sense, the ideas are Eranian." In the words of James Darmesteter in the preface of his recent translation of the Zend-Avesta into French (Paris, 1892, vol. I, p. xxxi): "Ce qui fait le caractère du Parsisme, c'est la précision absolue des dogmes, l'abondance des termes techniques, la sûreté de la nomenclature: or le sens précis que tel mot commun a pris dans le système, nulle considération de grammaire comparée ne peut le déterminer; les textes seuls et la tradition peuvent nous l'apprendre." These words of Lagarde and Darmesteter define the task which Dr. Mills has honestly endeavored to perform, i. e. to interpret the Avesta from the Avesta, with a constant reference to the kindred Eranian dialects and to indigenous tradition.

We part from the valuable and important book, which gives to every interpreter of the Avesta the materials in so apt and perspicuous an arrangement, with the expression of sincerest thanks to the author, and with the wish that Parts II and III may soon follow.

JENA, February, 1893.

EUGEN WILHELM.

De *ὥστε* particulae usu Herodoteo, Thucydideo, Xenophonteo. Scripsit MAX WEHMANN. Argentorati, MDCCCLXXXI.

Wehmann's treatise on the use of *ὥστε* in Herodotos, Thukydides and Xenophon has done nothing to clear up the theory of the troublesome particle, to which I devoted a special study in A. J. P. VII (not VI, as Professor Goodwin has it) 161-75, with results which have been taken up into the new Moods and Tenses. Still the detailed statements of the usage may be of